



MEMORANDUM

TO: Clark County Planning Commission

FROM: Patrick Lee, Long Range Planning Manager *Patrick F. Lee*

PREPARED BY: Evan Dust, Program Manager II
Oliver Orjiako, Senior Planner
Steve Duh, Senior Planner, Vancouver-Clark Parks & Recreation
Department
Jeroen Kok, Senior Planner, Vancouver-Clark Parks & Recreation
Department

DATE: November 24, 2003

SUBJECT: Revised Updated County Capital Facilities Plans

CASE NUMBER: CPT 99-003 Comprehensive Plan Review

The preparation of a new comprehensive plan requires the preparation of new capital facilities plans that recognize and support the new land use element. For most capital facilities, Clark County adopts by reference capital facilities plans that are prepared by other special districts and service providers. The major exception to that is for transportation where Clark County prepares and adopts its transportation capital facilities plan for the unincorporated area (both urban and rural). This staff report outlines all applicable capital facilities plans being proposed in support of this comprehensive plan adoption. This report updates the October staff report on this same topic.

Background

RCW 36.70A.070 "Comprehensive Plans -- Mandatory Elements" requires that counties planning under the act include in the comprehensive plan a capital facilities element. That element shall include: "(a) An inventory of existing capital facilities owned by public entities, showing the locations and capacities of the capital facilities; (b) a forecast of the future needs for such capital facilities; (c) the proposed locations and capacities of expanded or new capital facilities; (d) at least a six-year plan that will finance such capital facilities within projected funding capacities and clearly identifies sources of public money for such purposes; and (e) a requirement to reassess the land use element if probable funding falls short of meeting existing needs and to ensure that the land use element, capital facilities plan element, and financing plan within the capital facilities plan element are coordinated and consistent. Park and recreation facilities shall be included in the capital facilities plan element."

This report summarizes the capital facilities plans needed for the new comprehensive plan in two main report sections:

1. County Provided Capital Facilities:
 - a. Transportation for the unincorporated areas.
 - b. Parks and Open Space for the unincorporated areas (through Clark-Vancouver Parks)
 - c. Storm water drainage and water quality facilities for the unincorporated areas
 - d. Waste water treatment
 - e. County Buildings and other facilities
2. Capital Facilities for the Unincorporated area provided by other agencies:
 - a. Water supply and conveyance by Clark Public Utilities
 - b. Water supply and conveyance by City of Vancouver
 - c. Waste water collection and conveyance by Hazel Dell Sewer District
 - d. Waste water collection, conveyance and treatment by City of Vancouver
 - e. Schools

Consistent with state law, a minimum 6-year financially balanced capital facilities plan is presented for the consideration of the Planning Commission. Where there may be a public policy basis for a longer, less financially constrained list of capital projects to be considered by Planning Commission, these seven-plus year capital project lists are called, "Strategic Project Lists." For the each capital facility plan, a summary table is provided showing compliance with the 6-year financially balanced requirement with a full project list contained in the accompanying appendices. These summaries do not replace the capital facility plan documents that are summarized in the report; staff still recommends that Planning Commission adopt by reference those capital facility plan documents with the comprehensive plan.

County Provided Capital Facilities

Transportation

Table 1 summarizes the financially balanced 6-year capital facilities plan for transportation.

Table 1 Summary of 6-Year Transportation Capital Facilities Plan

Expenditures	
<i>Project Category</i>	<i>Expected Expenditure</i>
Transportation Improvement Projects	\$151,543,000
Carry Over Projects	\$3,850,000
Ongoing Programs	\$30,197,000
<i>Total Expenditures</i>	<i>\$185,590,000</i>
Revenues	
<i>Revenue Source</i>	<i>Expected Revenue</i>
General Road Fund Revenue Available for Capital	\$100,606,475
Funding Restricted to Capital Projects	\$94,103,000
<i>Total Revenue</i>	<i>\$194,709,475</i>

Appendix A, "Transportation", provides the 6-year capital facilities plan on which this summary is based and a 20-year "Strategic Transportation Project List".

The Strategic Transportation Project List fits generally within the \$536 Million of expected revenue for capital projects identified in the revenue perspective document. The Strategic Transportation Project List includes identification of projects that are expected to benefit areas of employment. Three employment areas (Discovery Corridor, St. Johns, and Hazel Dell) are supported by these transportation improvements to a total investment amount of \$166 Million.

To the extent that growth occurs in areas served by the projects on the proposed 6-year capital facilities plan the previously adopted transportation level-of-service should be maintained over the 6-year period. There is every reason to believe that will be the case given that 80% of growth over the next 20-years of the plan can be accommodated within the existing urban areas where the majority of the 6-year transportation projects are located.

Over the 20-year life of the plan, it is not possible to maintain transportation level-of-service without some assumption of additional revenue for transportation capital projects. This is particularly true in the newly designated urban areas where an urban transportation system has not been identified by county staff. The use of urban holding in the new urban will delay the impact of the urban boundary decision to allow either county staff or jurisdictional staff to develop the transportation plans which would identify the 6-year transportation projects in these areas. Staff expects to review transportation level-of-service standards in 2004.

Parks and Open Space

Vancouver-Clark Parks & Recreation Department has prepared a draft update of the Capital Facilities Plan (CFP) component of the Urban Parks, Recreation and Open Space Plan (Urban Plan) – adopted in 2002, and the Comprehensive Regional Parks, Recreation and Open Space Plan (Regional Plan) – adopted in 2000. The six-year CFP provides a roadmap for acquisition, development, enhancement, and repair of parks, open space, trails & greenways, and special

facilities. The Urban Parks component, which focuses on the unincorporated area with the Vancouver UGA, includes the acquisition and development of neighborhood and community parks, urban open spaces, sports fields, and trail corridors. The Regional Parks component focuses on regionally significant projects involving acquisition, development and restoration of regional parks, trails, greenways and special recreation facilities.

Table 2 summarizes the park capital facilities plan for the unincorporated area.

Table 2 Summary of 6-Year Park Capital Facilities Plan

Expenditures	
<i>Project Category</i>	<i>Expected Expenditure</i>
Urban parks	\$32,666,000
Regional parks	\$40,537,200
Regional trails	\$32,018,143
Regional greenways	\$17,040,000
Special Facilities	\$4,200,000
Maintenance Projects	\$1,632,600
<i>Total Expenditures</i>	<i>\$128,093,943</i>
Revenues	
<i>Revenue Source</i>	<i>Expected Revenue</i>
Conservation Futures/Areas	\$15,100,000
State	\$7,775,000
Federal	\$20,000,000
Partnerships	\$3,759,999
County Local Share	\$897,600
Donations	\$1,970,000
General Fund (City & County)	\$55,000
Grants (all sources)	\$29,589,866
Other/Miscellaneous	\$10,295,000
Parks Foundation	\$500,000
Park Impact Fees	\$13,735,000
Real Estate Excise Tax	\$24,416,478
<i>Total Revenue</i>	<i>\$128,093,943</i>

Appendix "B" is a consolidated listing of park capital facilities for the unincorporated area of Clark County for the 6-year period required by state law, from which Table 2 was drawn. It includes both regional and urban park facilities. It is proposed for incorporation by reference with this comprehensive plan adoption.

Storm Water Drainage and Water Quality Facilities

The county plans, designs and constructs storm water drainage and water quality facilities through a capital program funded by the county's clean water fee. Several parties have challenged the county's clean water fee as to its legality. If the fee survives the legal challenges, the county could mount a more aggressive capital facilities plan by either bonding the fee revenue or by obtaining low-interest loans. The 6-year storm water drainage and water quality program is summarized in Table 3.

Table 3 6-year Storm Water Drainage and Water Quality Capital Facilities Plan

Expenditures	
<i>Project Category</i>	<i>Expected Expenditure</i>
On-Going Capital Programs (a)	\$2,400,000
Capital Projects	\$6,200,000
Joint WSDOT Projects (b)	\$600,000
Support Expenditures (c)	\$600,000
<i>Total Expenditures</i>	<i>\$9,300,000</i>
Revenues	
<i>Revenue Source</i>	<i>Expected Revenue</i>
Clean Water Fee Available for Capital Projects	\$9,300,000
<i>Total Revenue</i>	<i>\$9,300,000</i>

Note: (a) Costs are estimated from the first year of on-going programs.

(b) Storm water project with Washington State Department of Transportation that benefits county and state.

(c) Non-capital costs necessary to development and implement capital projects.

Table 3 is summarized from the 6-year storm water drainage and water quality capital facilities plan contained in Appendix C and rounded to reflect the degree of variability that may exist in the estimates provided in that appendix.

The six-year capital facilities plan for storm water and water quality has a greater potential for variation and adjustment over the period covered (2004-2009) because:

- ◆ The program is relatively new in the county.
- ◆ The previously stated risk to the stability of funding.
- ◆ The program is primarily-driven by the need to meet the requirements of the county's National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit and as those requirements change the program must adjust to meet them.
- ◆ The nature of the drainage basins vary and the technical knowledge about the drainage basins improves as basin planning and engineering progresses with each year's projects.
- ◆ The latter years of this particular 6-year storm water and water quality CFP has not received formal review by the county's Clean Water Commission.

Waste Water Treatment Facility

Clark County owns and operates the Salmon Creek Waste Water Treatment Plant and associated regional conveyance system. Plans are underway for an expected expansion in these facilities that is expected to occur by 2008. Table 4 is drawn directly from the information on the county's waste water treatment capital facilities described in the *County Capital Facilities Financial Plan*.

Table 4 6-Year Waste Water Capital Facilities Plan

Expenditures	
<i>Project Category</i>	<i>Expected Expenditure</i>
Interceptor	\$10,100,000
Pump Station	5,300,000
Force main	3,300,000
Treatment Plant Phase IV expansion	24,800,000
Outfall	6,500,000
<i>Total Expenditures</i>	<i>\$50,000,000</i>
Revenues	
<i>Revenue Source</i>	<i>Expected Revenue</i>
Wholesale Customers	\$50,000,000
<i>Total Revenue</i>	<i>\$50,000,000</i>

The county is expected to obtain all of the needed revenue for the expansion of its waste water treatment facilities from the wholesale customers of the plant – the City of Battle Ground and the Hazel Dell Sewer District. Those two entities will cover their payments to the county from system development charges to new users connecting to the waste water conveyance system.¹

¹ Hazel Dell Sewer District recently proposed a waste water utility rate increase to address system development charges not being collected at a rate sufficient to meet bond obligations. When this occurs, the utility is required to increase utility rates for existing customers to meet the expected shortfall.

County Buildings and Other Facilities

The county owns and provides buildings and facilities necessary for the provision of general government and regional services. The *County Capital Facilities Financial Plan* contains a tabulation of the costs for improvements/expansions to general government and regional service buildings and facilities, which is summarized in Table 5.

Table 5 6-year County Buildings and Other Capital Facilities

Expenditures	
<i>Project Category</i>	<i>Expected Expenditure</i>
Public Service Center/Parking Garage	\$35,699,000
Courthouse Remodel	\$5,191,000
Franklin Center Remodel	\$795,000
Warehouse Space	\$3,000,000
1408 Franklin Remodel	\$3,000,000
VA Campus Development	\$25,000,000
CRESA Building Expansion	780,000
<i>Total Expenditures</i>	<i>\$73,465,000</i>
Revenues	
<i>Revenue Source</i>	<i>Expected Revenue</i>
Rent Savings	\$6,000,000
Earmarked Sources	\$25,780,000
General Obligation Bonds	\$41,685,000
<i>Total Revenue</i>	<i>\$73,465,000</i>

Capital Facilities Provided by Other Agencies

Clark Public Utilities Water Supply and Conveyance Capital Facilities Plan

The Clark Public Utilities Water System Plan (July 13, 1999) was reviewed and approved by the Clark County Board of Commissioners. It is incorporated into the county's capital facilities plan by reference. Discussions with Clark Public Utilities staff indicate that the district serves the majority of the geographic area of Clark County with public water. The district staff is confident that the urban area expansions within their service district can be served with public water since most of the infrastructure cost is borne by the new utility customers. Table 6 provides a summary of the 6-year water capital facilities plan for Clark Public Utilities.

Table 6 6-year Clark Public Utilities Water Capital Facilities Plan

Expenditures	
<i>Project Category</i>	<i>Expected Expenditure</i>
General Plant	\$1,213,243
Reservoirs and Boosters	\$9,364,730
Main Extensions/Upgrades	\$24,955,291
Source of Supply	\$9,262,440
Meters/Meter Installation	\$941,600
<i>Total Expenditures</i>	<i>\$45,737,304</i>
Revenues	
<i>Revenue Source</i>	<i>Expected Revenue</i>
Public Works Trust Fund Loans	\$10,569,000
Revenue from Bond Sales	\$9,252,670
System Development Charges	\$14,611,173
Operating Revenues Available for Capital	\$11,304,461
<i>Total Revenue (estimated)</i>	<i>\$45,737,304</i>

Appendix "D" contains the information provided by Clark Public Utilities summarized in Table 6.

City of Vancouver Water Supply and Conveyance Capital Facilities Plan

The City of Vancouver serves a portion of the Vancouver urban area outside of its incorporated limits with water and sewer service.

The last review of the water capital facilities plan by the city was conducted in April 1997 at which time the City indicated that its service area could be served by the central facilities identified in its plan. It is expected that the city will continue to serve development outside of its incorporated limits in response to requests from property owners to do so.

Table 7 is a summary of the 6-year capital facilities plan for the City of Vancouver Water Engineering (Appendix "E"). It should be noted that since the water system operated by the city provides service to both incorporated and unincorporated areas, the 6-year CFP covers both as well.

Table 7 6-year City of Vancouver Water Capital Facilities Plan

Expenditures	
<i>Project Category</i>	<i>Expected Expenditure</i>
Water Station Projects	\$18,225,000
Distribution System Mains	\$4,530,000
Transmission Mains	\$5,100,000
Roadway Coordination Plans	\$2,090,000
SCIP Projects ²	\$12,250,000
<i>Total Expenditures</i>	<i>\$42,195,000</i>
Revenues	
<i>Revenue Source</i>	<i>Expected Revenue</i>
System Development Charges	\$20,592,000
Utility Capital Reserves (estimated)	\$21,603,000
<i>Total Revenue</i>	<i>\$42,195,000</i>

Note: The City of Vancouver estimates revenues over the 6-year period for all utilities (sewer, water, storm water) and reported aggregate figures only in the November 12, 2003 draft document. Besides the use of water utility capital reserves identified in the table, there are additional capital reserves plus operating revenues available to support the water system capital program.

² SCIP – Sewer Connection Incentive Program which is funded through the water fund but whose projects are on the city's waste water capital facilities plan.

Hazel Dell Sewer District Waste Water Collection and Conveyance Capital Facilities Plan

The Hazel Dell Sewer District Comprehensive General Sewer Plan (March 2001) was approved by the Clark County Board of Commissioners in August 2001 under Resolution 2001-08-22. It is incorporated into the county's capital facilities plan by reference. Discussions with Hazel Dell Sewer District staff indicate that the district staff has reviewed most of the proposed comprehensive plan designations. As a result of that review, the district staff indicated that future updates and sewer plan addendums will be needed to bring the sewer plan into consistency with the comprehensive land use plan.

Table 8 summarizes the 6-year capital facilities plan for the Hazel Dell Sewer District.

Expenditures	
<i>Project Category</i>	<i>Expected Expenditure</i>
Capital Improvements (Basins)	\$8,866,071
I&I Program	\$392,189
<i>Total Expenditures</i>	<i>\$9,258,260</i>
Revenues	
<i>Revenue Source</i>	<i>Expected Revenue</i>
R & R Fund	\$2,315,542
Capital Fund	\$6,942,718
<i>Total Revenue</i>	<i>\$9,258,260</i>

The values in Table 8 are summarized from the details provided in Appendix F.

City of Vancouver Waste Water Collection, Conveyance and Treatment Capital Facilities Plan

The City of Vancouver sanitary sewer service area encompasses over 50 square miles including urban areas generally bounded by Vancouver Lake on the west, NE 202nd Avenue on the east, the Columbia River on the south and NE 99th Street on the north. The City formally adopted the sewer capital facilities plan in January 1995; it is now being updated. Discussion with city staff indicates that the city will need to adopt a capital facilities plan that specifies how the proposed urban growth areas within its service area will be served. It is expected that, as a result of that capital facilities planning process, the city will continue to service development inside its service area but outside of its incorporated limits in response to requests from property owners to do so.

Table 9 summarizes the City of Vancouver Sewer System Capital Improvement Program (Appendix G). As with the water supply and conveyance system operated by the City of Vancouver, the sewer treatment, collection and conveyance system serves land uses both within the incorporated city and a portion of the unincorporated area. It is not possible to attribute costs to the unincorporated area only.

Table 9 City of Vancouver Sewer System Capital Facilities Plan

Expenditures	
<i>Project Category</i>	<i>Expected Expenditure</i>
Roadway Coordination	\$4,856,000
Collection System	\$3,730,000
Pump Station Program	\$1,405,000
Relief Sewer Program	\$4,439,000
Substandard Main Program	\$1,350,000
Wastewater program	\$2,852,000
<i>Total Expenditures</i>	<i>\$18,632,000</i>
Revenues	
<i>Revenue Source</i>	<i>Expected Revenue</i>
System Development Charges	\$18,632,000
<i>Total Revenue</i>	<i>\$18,632,000</i>

Note:

(1) The sewer capital facilities plan also includes improvements under the Sewer Connection Incentive Program (SCIP), which are funded from the water fund.

(2) The City of Vancouver estimates revenues over the 6-year period for all utilities (sewer, water, storm water) and reported aggregate figures only in the November 12, 2003 draft document. There are additional sewer capital reserves available for meeting debt service and to meet any unexpected shortfall in system development charges.

Clark County School Districts Capital Facilities Plan

The capital facilities plans for school districts in Clark County have been considered by Planning Commission in a series of public hearings held on July 17th, 2003. The Planning Commission forwarded those plans to the board for consideration. The Clark County School Districts Capital Facilities Plan is incorporated into the county's capital facilities plan by reference. Like other service providers, these plans were based on the 1994 land use plan. There will be the need for school districts to update their plans to reflect the new land use plan. Staff is asking Planning Commission to reaffirm that adoption with consideration of this comprehensive plan.

Table 10 summarizes the capital facilities plans of the Clark County school districts

Table 10 Summary of Capital Facilities Plans for Clark County School Districts

SCHOOL DISTRICT	NUMBER OF ADDITIONS OR EXPANSIONS/REMODELS			ESTIMATED COSTS IN MILLIONS	FUND SOURCE	
	ELEMENTARY	MIDDLE/JUNIOR	SENIOR	6-YEAR EXPANSION	SECURED	UNSECURED
VANCOUVER	7 exp 2 exp 2 new	1 new	1 rem ⁶	\$116.9	Bond and State Match \$87.5m	State Match, Bonds, Impact Fees \$29.4m
EVERGREEN	3 new and two property	1 new and one property	1 new and one property	\$123.8m	Bond, State Match, and Impact Fees \$97.6m	State Match, Bond and Impact Fees \$26.2m
BATTLE GROUND	2 new	2 new	1 exp ⁷ 1 new ⁸	\$89.3 ⁹	Impact Fees \$.2m	Bond \$51.2m, State Match \$33.8 ⁴ , Imp. Fees \$.2 ⁵
CAMAS	1 new ¹⁰	1 rem ¹¹	1 new ¹²	\$55.5m	Bond \$43m; State Match \$8.3m; Impact Fees \$.1m	State Match, Bonds, Impact Fees \$4.1m
RIDGEFIELD		1 rem	1 new	\$31.2m	Impact Fees \$.3m	Bond \$26.0, State Match \$4.9 ⁴ Impact Fees \$.6 ⁵
WASHOUGAL	1 new			\$12.8m	Impact Fees \$1.1m	State Match, Bond, and Impact Fees \$11.7m
HOCKINSON	1 exp	1 exp	1 new ¹³	\$22.2	Bond and State Match \$22m	State Match, Bond, Impact Fees \$.2m
LA CENTER	2 exp	1 exp	1 exp	\$22.5m ¹⁴	Bond \$12.8m State Match \$6.8m Impact Fees \$.1m	Impact Fees, grants or donations \$2.8m
GREEN MT.	1 exp			.4m		

Source: Preston/Gates/Ellis, Clark County School Districts Capital Facilities Plan

Exp= Expansions, Rem =Remodel, Rep=Replaced, M=Million, For more specific information, see each School District's Individual Capital Facilities Plan.

⁴ The State's release of matching funds will not exceed the actual need.

⁵ Projection based on development pattern assumptions; may decline if the number of new building permits decreases.

⁶ The Vancouver School of Arts & Academics, a combined middle/high school.

⁷ Battle Ground School District may add a new high school auditorium.

⁸ Alternative high school.

⁹ Includes \$4.8m for the cost of portables.

¹⁰ If grades are not reconfigured, Camas School District will build an elementary school. If grades are reconfigured, the District will expand the high school.

¹¹ Camas High School converted to middle school.

¹² Camas School District is finishing construction on a new high school that will be open in the fall of 2003. Students at the existing high school and ninth graders that are attending classes at the middle school, will attend the new high school in the fall. The existing high school will become a second middle school.

¹³ Hockinson School District is finishing construction on its first high school. Ninth and tenth graders in the district will be attending classes in the new high school in the fall of 2003

¹⁴ Includes other District – wide improvements, such as modernization of the K-8 Multipurpose Building, and relocation of the maintenance and bus facility.

Summary

Staff has prepared transportation capital facilities plans covering the 6-year period required by state law and obtained similar plans from providers of parks, sewer, water, storm water facilities, schools and general government facilities. While this summary document and the supporting plans which are adopted by reference meet the requirements for this plan update, staff again recommends applying urban holding to the expanded UGAs to allow capital facility providers to complete capital facilities plan amendments to address the new urban areas.

H:\LONG RANGE PLANNING\PROJECTS\CPT 99.003 FIVE YEAR UPDATE\CFP\20031117 REVISED UPDATED CAPITAL FACILITIES PLAN STAFF REPORT.DOC